

Serial No. 10/696,996
Amdt. dated April 16, 2007
Reply to Office Action of December 15, 2006

Docket No. HI-0184

REMARKS

Claims 5-63 are pending. Of these, claims 14-24, 28, and 43 have been allowed. In this paper, claims 5, 7, 10, 14-17, 20, 22, 24, 25, 27-29, 31, 40, 41, 46, and 47 have been amended, claims 1-4 have been canceled, and claims 50-63 have been added to recite additional features of the embodiments disclosed in the specification. Applicants submit that claims 14-24, 28, and 43 remain allowable notwithstanding the amendments presented herein.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

I. The Claim Objection.

Claim 1 was found to be objectionable on grounds that the “extending portion” is not clearly recited. Claim 1 has been amended to recite: “wherein the extending portion does not overlap with the panel.” It is respectfully submitted that this amendment is sufficient to overcome the objection to claim 1.

II. The Rejection under 35 USC § 102(b).

Claims 10-13, 25-27, 34-37, 39, 48, and 49 were rejected for being anticipated by the Gotoh patent. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw this rejection for the following reasons.

To anticipate claim 10, the Gotoh patent must disclose all the features recited in this claim. There can be no exceptions.

Claim 10 recites a filter support that is “disposed between the front surface filter and the front cover” to physically support the front surface filter and electrically connect the filter with at least one of the back or front covers. The Gotoh patent does not disclose these features.

As shown in Figure 7, the Gotoh panel includes a front surface filter 2C and a front cover 3. Unlike claim 10, the Gotoh patent does not disclose that filter support 7 is between the filter and front cover. Rather, front cover 3 is directly connected to front filter 2C, and filter support 7 is located under or adjacent to layers comprising the front filter. Accordingly, claim 10 and Gotoh are directed to structurally different plasma display panels.

Because the Gotoh patent does not disclose all the features of claim 10, it is respectfully submitted that Gotoh does not anticipate this claim or any of its dependent claims.

Claim 34 recites that the filter support is “formed on a front surface of the first metallic layer” for electrically connecting the front surface filter with the back cover or the front cover. (Emphasis added). The Gotoh patent does not disclose these features. As shown in Figure 7, filter support 7 is not formed on a front surface of conductive coating 20, which the Examiner has identified as corresponding to the metallic layer of the Gotoh panel. Moreover, filter support 7 contacts a rear surface of mesh layer 12, not its front surface. Based on these differences, it is respectfully submitted that the Gotoh patent does not anticipate claim 34 and its dependent claims.

Serial No. 10/696,996
Amdt. dated April 16, 2007
Reply to Office Action of December 15, 2006

Docket No. HI-0184

New claim 62 has been added to recite features similar to those which patentably claim 10 from the Gotoh patent but depending from claim 34, i.e., that the filter support is disposed between the front surface filter and the front cover. It is therefore submitted that claim 62 is allowable, not only by virtue of its dependency from claim 34 but also based on the features separately recited therein.

Claim 39 recites “a metallic layer formed on a prescribed area of a front surface, a rear surface, and a lateral face of the front surface filter.” The Gotoh patent does not disclose these features. In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that conductive coating 20 corresponds to the metallic layer recited in the claims. However, coating 20 is not formed on filter 2C. Moreover, mesh layer 12, which is electrically connected to coating 20, is only formed as one layer within the filter. Neither coating 20 or mesh layer 12 is formed on the front surface, rear surface, and a lateral face of filter 2C as required by claim 39.

Applicants further note that elements 3 and 4 of Gotoh are not included in filter 2C and therefore cannot be properly relied on to supply the claimed features relating to the formation of the metallic layer on all of the surfaces of the front surface filter. Based on these differences, it is respectfully submitted that the Gotoh patent does not anticipate claim 39 and its dependent claims.

New claim 63 has been added to recite features similar to those which patentably claim 10 from the Gotoh patent but depending from claim 39, i.e., that the filter support is disposed

Serial No. 10/696,996
Amdt. dated April 16, 2007
Reply to Office Action of December 15, 2006

Docket No. HI-0184

between the front surface filter and the front cover. It is therefore submitted that claim 63 is allowable, not only by virtue of its dependency from claim 39 but also based on the features separately recited therein.

III. The Rejection under 35 USC § 103(a).

Claims 5-9, 29-33, 38-42, and 44-47 were rejected for being obvious in view of a Gotoh-Koike combination. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw this rejection for the following reasons.

Claim 5 recites a metallic layer formed on an extending portion of the front surface filter, "wherein the extending portion does not overlap with the panel and is located between the filter support and the support member." As acknowledged by the Examiner in the Office Action, the front filter of the Gotoh panel does the extending portion of claim 5. The Koike patent was cited to make up for these deficiencies.

The Koike patent discloses a filter 60 having a portion that extends beyond a display area 00 of a panel. However, the Koike patent does not disclose the features added by amendment to claim 5, i.e., that the portion of filter 60 which extends beyond display area 00 is located between a support member and a filter support that electrically connects filter 60 with the back cover of the panel. Based on these differences, it is respectfully submitted that claim 5 and its dependent claims are allowable over a Gotoh-Koike combination.

Serial No. 10/696,996
Amdt. dated April 16, 2007
Reply to Office Action of December 15, 2006

Docket No. HI-0184

Claim 29 recites that the metallic layer “does not overlap with the panel” and is “formed on the front surface filter.” These features are not taught or suggested by the cited references. The Gotoh panel includes a conductive coating 20 that electrically connects mesh layer 12 with a back cover 4. The Examiner identified coating 20 as corresponding to the metallic layer of claim 29. However, coating 20 is not formed on front surface filter 2C as required by claim 29 and therefore is different from the “metallic layer” of this claim.

The Koike patent is even less relevant as its front filter does not include a metallic layer of any type, let alone one that has the features of the metallic layer recited in claim 29.

Based on the foregoing differences, it is respectfully submitted that claim 29 and its dependent claims are allowable over a Gotoh-Koike combination.

Claim 9 recites that the metallic layer, filter support and support member respectively have at least one hole, and that a screw is disposed to pass through the hole such that the metallic layer, filter support and support member are fixed to one another. The Gotoh patent does not teach or suggest these features. That is, while filter support 7 and support member 3 have holes through which screw 6 passes, coating 20 does not have a hole for accommodating screw 6.

Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 9 is allowable, not only by virtue of the features recited in its base claim but also based on the features separately recited therein.

Serial No. 10/696,996
Amdt. dated April 16, 2007
Reply to Office Action of December 15, 2006

Docket No. HI-0184

Claim 26 was rejected for being obvious in view of a Gotoh-Yoshikawa combination. This rejection is traversed on grounds that the Yoshikawa patent does not teach or suggest the features of base claim 10 missing from the Gohoh patent.

New claims 50-61 have been added to the application.

Claim 50 recites that the front surface filter of claim 5 is “formed from multiple layers and wherein the filter support is located between all layers of the front surface filter and the back cover.” These features are not taught or suggested by the cited references, i.e., filter support 7 is disclosed to be adjacent to at least some of the layers of front filter 2C in the Gotoh panel, not under all of the layers forming filter 2C as required by claim 50. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 50 is allowable, not only by virtue of its dependency from claim 5 but also based on the features separately recited therein.

Claim 51 recites that the metallic layer of claim 50 is “not included in the layers of the front surface filter.” The Gotoh patent discloses and shows in Figure 7 that mesh layer 12 is included as part of filter 2C. And, to the extent that the Examiner is relying on coating 20 for these features, it is noted that coating 20 does not satisfy the other requirements of the “metallic layer” recited in base claim 5, e.g., a metallic layer formed on an extending portion of the front surface filter.

Claim 52 and 53 recites that the metallic layer does not overlap the panel. These features are not taught or suggested by the cited references.

Serial No. 10/696,996
Amdt. dated April 16, 2007
Reply to Office Action of December 15, 2006

Docket No. HI-0184

Claim 54 recites that “the metallic layer is separate from the front surface filter.” These features are not taught or suggested by the cited references.

Claim 55 recites that the filter support is not connected to the support member. These features are not taught or suggested by the cited references.

Claim 56 recites that the front surface filter is a film-type filter. These features are not taught or suggested by the cited references.

Claim 57 recites that the extending portion of the front surface filter of claim 5 “has a first width and the metallic layer has a second width less than the first width.” These features are not taught or suggested by the cited references.

The remaining new claims recite similar features depending from other independent claims.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and timely allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Serial No. 10/696,996
Amdt. dated April 16, 2007
Reply to Office Action of December 15, 2006

Docket No. HI-0184

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim, Esq.
Registration No. 36,186

Samuel W. Ntiros, Esq.
Registration No. 39,318

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
703 766-3777
Date: April 16, 2007

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610